arXiv:1512.03881v1 [math.PR] 12 Dec 2015

On the Second Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing

Rajeeva L. Karandikar and B. V. Rao

Chennai Mathematical Institute, Chennai.

Abstract

Let $X^1, \ldots, X^d$ be sigma-martingales on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathsf{P})$. We show that every bounded martingale (with respect to the underlying filtration) admits an integral representation w.r.t. $X^1, \ldots, X^d$ if and only if there is no equivalent probability measure (other than P) under which $X^1, \ldots, X^d$ are sigma-martingales.

From this we deduce the second fundamental theorem of asset pricing- that completeness of a market is equivalent to uniqueness of Equivalent Sigma-Martingale Measure (ESMM).

2010 Mathematics Subject Classication: 91G20, 60G44, 97M30, 62P05.

Key words and phrases: Martingales, Sigma Martingales, Stochastic Calculus, Martingale Representation, No Arbitrage, Completeness of Markets.

1 Introduction

The (first) fundamental theorem of asset pricing says that a market consisting of finitely many stocks satisfies the *No Arbitrage property* (NA) if and only there exists an *Equivalent Martingale Measure* (EMM)- *i.e. there exists an equivalent probability measure under which the (discounted) stocks are (local) martingales.* The No Arbitrage property has to be suitably defined when we are dealing in continuous time, where one rules out approximate arbitrage in the class of admissible strategies. For a precise statement in the case when the underlying processes are locally bounded, see Delbaen and Schachermayer [4]. Also see Bhatt and Karandikar [1] for an alternate formulation, where the approximate arbitrage is defined only in terms of simple strategies. For the general case, the result is true when local martingale in the statement above is replaced by sigma-martingale. See Delbaen and Schachermayer [5]. They have an example where the No Arbitrage property holds but there is no equivalent measure under which the underlying process is a local martingale. However, there is an equivalent measure under which the process is a sigma-martingale.

The second fundamental theorem of asset pricing says that the market is complete (*i.e. every contingent claim can be replicated by trading on the underlying securities*) if and only if the EMM is unique. Interestingly, this property was studied by probabilists well before the connection between finance and stochastic calculus was established (by Harrison-Pliska [9]). The completeness of market is same as the question: when is every martingale representable as a stochastic integral w.r.t. a given set of martingales $\{M^1, \ldots, M^d\}$. When $M^1, \ldots, M^d$ is the d-dimensional Wiener Process, this property was proven by Ito [10]. Jacod and Yor [13] proved that if M is a P-local martingale, then every martingale N admits a representation as a stochastic integral w.r.t. M if and only if there is no probability measure Q (other than P) such that Q is equivalent to P and M is a Q-local martingale. The situation in higher dimension is more complex. The obvious generalisation to higher dimension is not true as was noted by Jacod-Yor [13].

To remedy the situation, a notion of vector stochastic integral was introduced- where a vector valued predictable process is the integrand and vector valued martingale is the integrator. The resulting integrals yield a class larger than the linear

space generated by component wise integrals. See [12], [2]. However, one has to prove various properties of stochastic integrals once again.

Here we achieve the same objective in another fashion avoiding defining integration again from scratch. In the same breath, we also take into account the general case, when the underlying processes need not be bounded but satisfy the property NFLVR and thus one has a equivalent sigma-martingale measure (ESMM). We say that a martingale M admits a integral representation w.r.t. $(X^1, X^2, \ldots, X^d)$ if there exits predictable f, g^j such that $g^j \in \mathbb{L}(X^j)$,

$$Y_t = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \int_0^t g_s^j dX_s^j,$$

$f \in \mathbb{L}(Y)$ and

$$M_t = \int_0^t f_s dY_s.$$

The security Y can be thought of as a mutual fund or an index fund and the investor is trading on such a fund trying to replicate the security M.

We will show that if for a multidimensional r.c.l.l. process $(X^1, X^2, \ldots, X^d)$ an ESMM exists, then all bounded martingales admit a representation w.r.t X^j, $1 \leq j \leq d$ if and only if ESMM is unique.

2 Preliminaries and Notation

Let us start with some notations. $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathsf{P})$ denotes a complete probability space with a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_\cdot) = \{\mathcal{F}_t : \ t \geq 0\}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_0$ consists of all P-null sets (in $\mathcal{F}$) and

$$\cap_{t>s} \mathcal{F}_t = \mathcal{F}_s \ \ \forall s \geq 0.$$

For various notions, definitions and standard results on stochastic integrals, we refer the reader to Jacod [11] or Protter [15].

For a local martingale M, let $\mathbb{L}^1_m(M)$ be the class of predictable processes f such that there exists a sequence of stopping times $\sigma_k \uparrow \infty$ with

$$\mathsf{E}[\{\int_0^{\sigma_k} f_s^2 d[M,M]_s\}^{\frac{1}{2}}] < \infty$$

and for such an f, $N = \int f dM$ is defined and is a local martingale.

Let $\mathbb{M}$ denote the class of martingales and for $M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d \in \mathbb{M}$ let

$$\mathbb{C}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d) = \{Z \in \mathbb{M} \,:\, Z_t = Z_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{d} \int_0^t f_s^j dM_s^j,\ f^j \in \mathbb{L}_m^1(M^j)\}$$

and for $T < \infty$, let

$$\tilde{\mathbb{K}}_T(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d) = \{Z_T \,:\, Z \in \mathbb{C}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)\}.$$

For the case $d = 1$, Yor [17] had proved that $\tilde{\mathbb{K}}_T$ is a closed subspace of $\mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathsf{P})$. The problem in case $d > 1$ is that in general $\tilde{\mathbb{K}}_T(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ need not be closed. Jacod-Yor [13] gave an example where M^1, M^2 are continuous square integrable martingales and $\tilde{\mathbb{K}}_T(M^1, M^2)$ is not closed.

For martingales $M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d$, let

$$\mathbb{F}(M^1, \ldots, M^d) = \{Z \in \mathbb{M} : Z_t = Z_0 + \int_0^t f_s dY_s,\ f \in \mathbb{L}_m^1(Y),\ Y \in \mathbb{C}(M^1, \ldots, M^d)\}.$$

Let

$$\mathbb{K}_T(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d) = \{Z_T \,:\, Z \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)\}.$$

The main result of the next section is

THEOREM **2.1** *Let $M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d$ be martingales. Then $\mathbb{K}_T(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ is closed in $\mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathsf{P})$.*

This would be deduced from

THEOREM **2.2** *Let $M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d$ be martingales and $Z^n \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ be such that $\mathsf{E}[|Z_t^n - Z_t|] \to 0$ for all t. Then $Z \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$.*

When $M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d$ are square integrable martingales, the analogue of Theorem 2.1 for $\mathbb{L}^2$ follows from the work of Davis-Varaiya [6]. However, for the EMM characterisation via integral representation, one needs the $\mathbb{L}^1$ version, which we deduce using change of measure technique.

We will need the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality (see [14]) (for $p = 1$) which states that there exist universal constants c^1, c^2 such that for all martingales M and $T < \infty$,

$$c^1 \mathsf{E}[([M,M]_T)^{\frac{1}{2}}] \leq \mathsf{E}[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |M_t|] \leq c^2 \mathsf{E}[([M,M]_T)^{\frac{1}{2}}].$$

After proving Theorem 2.1, in the next section we will introduce sigma-martingales and give some elementary properties. Then we come to the main theorem on integral representation of martingales. This is followed by the second fundamental theorem of asset pricing.

3 Proof of Theorem 2.1

We begin with a few auxiliary results. In this section, we fix martingales $M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d$.

LEMMA **3.1** *Let*

$\mathbb{C}_b(M^1, \ldots, M^d) = \{Z \in \mathbb{M} : Z_t = Z_0 + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^t f_s^j dM_s^j,\ f^j$ *bounded predictable* $, 1 \leq j \leq d\}$,

$\mathbb{F}_b(M^1, \ldots, M^d) = \{Z \in \mathbb{M} : Z_t = Z_0 + \int_0^t f_s dY_s,\ f \in \mathbb{L}_m^1(Y),\ Y \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, \ldots, M^d)\}$.

Then $\mathbb{F}_b(M^1, \ldots, M^d) = \mathbb{F}(M^1, \ldots, M^d)$.

PROOF : Since bounded predictable process belong to $\mathbb{L}_m^1(N)$ for every martingale N, it follows that $\mathbb{C}_b(M^1, \ldots, M^d) \subseteq \mathbb{C}(M^1, \ldots, M^d)$ and hence $\mathbb{F}_b(M^1, \ldots, M^d) \subseteq \mathbb{F}(M^1, \ldots, M^d)$.

For the other part, let $Z \in \mathbb{F}$ be given by

$$Z_t = Z_0 + \int_0^t f_s dY_s,\ f \in \mathbb{L}_m^1(Y)$$

where

$$Y_t = \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^t g_s^j dM_s^j$$

with $g^j \in \mathbb{L}_m^1(M^j)$. Let $\xi_s = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^d |g_s^j|$, $h_s^j = \frac{g_s^j}{\xi_s}$ and

$$V_t = \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^t h_s^j dM_s^j.$$

Since h^j are bounded, it follows that $V \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. Using $g^j_s = \xi_s h^j_s$ and $g^j \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(M^j)$, it follows that $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(V)$ and

$$Y_t = \int_0^t \xi_s dV_s.$$

Since $f \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(Y)$, it follows that $f\xi \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(V)$ and $\int f dY = \int f\xi dV$. ∎

LEMMA **3.2** *Let $Z \in \mathbb{M}$ be such that there exists a sequence of stopping times $\sigma_k \uparrow \infty$ with $\mathsf{E}_\mathsf{P}[\sqrt{[Z,Z]_{\sigma_k}}] < \infty$ and $X^k \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ where $X^k_t = Z_{t\wedge\sigma_k}$. Then $Z \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$.*

PROOF : Let $X^k = \int f^k dY^k$ for $k \geq 1$ with $f^k \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(Y^k)$ and $Y^k \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. Let $\phi^{k,j}$ be bounded predictable processes such that

$$Y^k_t = \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^t \phi^{k,j}_s dM^j_s.$$

Let $c_k > 0$ be a common bound for $\phi^{k,1}, \phi^{k,2}, \ldots, \phi^{k,d}$. Let us define η^j, f by

$$\eta^j_t = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{1}{c_k} \phi^{k,j}_t 1_{\{(\sigma_{k-1}, \sigma_k]\}}(t).$$

$$f_t = \sum_{k=1}^\infty c_k f^k_t 1_{\{(\sigma_{-1}, \sigma_k]\}}(t).$$

$$Y_t = \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^t \eta^j_s dM^j_s.$$

By definition, η^j is bounded by 1 for every j and thus $Y \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. We can note that

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{t\wedge\sigma_k} - Z_{t\wedge\sigma_{k-1}} &= X^k_{t\wedge\sigma_k} - X^k_{t\wedge\sigma_{k-1}} \\ &= \int_0^t f^k_s 1_{\{(\sigma_{k-1}, \sigma_k]\}}(s) dY^k_s \\ &= \int_0^t f_s 1_{\{(\sigma_{k-1}, \sigma_k]\}}(s) dY_s. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$Z_{t\wedge\sigma_k} = Z_0 + \int_0^t 1_{[0,\sigma_k]}(s) f_s dY_s$$

and hence

$$[Z,Z]_{\sigma_k} = \int_0^{\sigma_k} (f_s)^2 d[Y,Y]_s.$$

Since by assumption, for all k

$$\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[\sqrt{[Z,Z]_{\sigma_k}}\,] < \infty$$

it follows that $f \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(Y)$. This proves the required result. ∎

LEMMA **3.3** *Let $Z^n \in \mathbb{M}$ be such that $\mathsf{E}[|Z^n_t - Z_t|] \to 0$ for all t. Then there exists a sequence of stopping times $\sigma_k \uparrow \infty$ and a subsequence $\{n^j\}$ such that each $k \geq 1$,*

$$\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[Z,Z]_{\sigma_k}}] < \infty$$

and writing $Y^j = Z^{n^j}$,

$$\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[Y^j - Z, Y^j - Z]_{\sigma_k}}\,] \to 0 \text{ as } j \uparrow \infty. \tag{3.4}$$

PROOF : Let $n_0 = 0$. For each j, $\mathsf{E}[|Z^n_j - Z_j|] \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ and hence we can choose $n^j > n^{(j-1)}$ such that

$$\mathsf{E}[|Z^{n^j}_j - Z_j|] \leq 2^{-j}.$$

Then using Doob's maximal inequality we have

$$\mathsf{P}(\sup_{t\leq j}|Z^{n^j}_t - Z_t| \geq \frac{1}{j^2}) \leq \frac{j^2}{2^j}.$$

As a consequence, writing $Y^j = Z^{n^j}$, we have

$$\eta_t = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sup_{s\leq t}|Y^j_s - Z_s| < \infty \text{ a.s. for all } t < \infty. \tag{3.5}$$

Now define

$$U_t = |Z_t| + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |Y^j_t - Z_t|.$$

In view of (3.5), it follows that U is r.c.l.l. adapted process. For any stopping time $\tau \leq m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{E}[U_\tau] &= \mathsf{E}[|Z_\tau|] + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathsf{E}[|Y^j_\tau - Z_\tau|] \\
&\leq \mathsf{E}[|Z_m|] + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathsf{E}[|Y^j_m - Z_m|] \\
&\leq \mathsf{E}[|Z_m|] + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathsf{E}[|Y^j_m - Z_m|] + \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \\
&< \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used that $Z, Y^j - Z$ being martingales, $|Z|, |Y^j - Z|$ are sub-martingales and $\tau \leq m$. Now defining

$$\sigma_k = \inf\{t \,:\, U_t \geq k \text{ or } U_{t-} \geq k\} \wedge k$$

it follows that σ_k are bounded stop times increasing to ∞ with

$$\sup_{s \leq \sigma_k} U_s \leq k + U_{\sigma_k}$$

and hence

$$\mathsf{E}[\sup_{s \leq \sigma_k} U_s] < \infty. \tag{3.6}$$

Thus, for each k fixed $\mathsf{E}[\sup_{s \leq \sigma_k} |Z_s|] < \infty$ and thus Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality ($p = 1$ case), we have $\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[Z, Z]_{\sigma_k}}] < \infty$. In view of (3.5)

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \sup_{s \leq \sigma_k} |Y^j_s - Z_s| = 0 \quad a.s.$$

and is dominated by $(\sup_{s \leq \sigma_k} U_s)$ which in turn is integrable as seen in (3.6). Thus by dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \mathsf{E}[\sup_{s \leq \sigma_k} |Y^j_s - Z_s|] = 0.$$

The result (3.4) now follows from Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality ($p = 1$ case).

∎

LEMMA **3.7** *Let $V \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ and τ be a bounded stopping time such that $\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[V,V]_\tau}\,] < \infty$. Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $U \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ such that*

$$\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[V-U, V-U]_\tau}\,] \leq \epsilon.$$

PROOF : Let $V = \int f dX$ where $f \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(X)$ and $X \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. Since

$$[V,V]_t = \int_0^t |f_s|^2 d[X,X]_s,$$

the assumption on V gives

$$\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{\textstyle\int_0^\tau |f_s|^2 d[X,X]_s}] < \infty. \tag{3.8}$$

Defining $f^k_s = f_s 1_{\{|f_s| \leq k\}}$, let

$$U^k = \int f^k dX.$$

Since $X \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ and f^k is bounded, it follows that

$$U^k \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d).$$

Note that as $k \to \infty$,

$$\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[V-U^k, V-U^k]_\tau}] = \mathsf{E}[\sqrt{\textstyle\int_0^\tau |f_s|^2 1_{\{|f_s|>k\}} d[X,X]_s}] \to 0$$

in view of (3.8). The result now follows by taking $U = U^k$ with k large enough so that $\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[V-U^k, V-U^k]_\tau}] < \epsilon$.

∎

LEMMA **3.9** *Suppose $Z \in \mathbb{M}$ and τ is a bounded stopping time such that $\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[Z,Z]_\tau}\,] < \infty$, $Z_t = Z_{t\wedge\tau}$. Let $U^n \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ with $U^n_0 = 0$ be such that*

$$\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[U^n - Z, U^n - Z]_\tau}\,] \leq 4^{-n}.$$

Then there exists $X \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ and $f \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(X)$ such that

$$Z_t = Z_0 + \int_0^t f_s dX_s. \tag{3.10}$$

PROOF : Since $U^n \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ with $U^n_0 = 0$, get bounded predictable processes $\{f^{n,j} : n \geq 1,\, 1 \leq j \leq d\}$ such that

$$U^n_t = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \int_0^t f^{n,j}_s dM^j_s. \tag{3.11}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $U^n_t = U^n_{t\wedge\tau}$ and $f^{n,j}_s = f^{n,j}_s 1_{[0,\tau]}(s)$. Let

$$\zeta = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^n \sqrt{[U^n - Z, U^n - Z]_\tau}.$$

Then $\mathsf{E}[\zeta] < \infty$ and hence $\mathsf{P}(\zeta < \infty) = 1$. Let

$$\eta = \zeta + \sqrt{[Z, Z]_\tau} + \sum_{j=1}^{d} \sqrt{[M^j, M^j]_\tau}$$

Let $c = \mathsf{E}[\exp\{-\eta\}]$ and let Q be the probability measure on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F})$ defined by

$$\frac{d\mathsf{Q}}{d\mathsf{P}} = \frac{1}{c} \exp\{-\eta\}.$$

Then it follows that $\alpha = \mathsf{E}_\mathsf{Q}[\eta^2] < \infty$. Noting that

$$\eta^2 \geq [Z, Z]_\tau + \sum_{j=1}^{d} [M^j, M^j]_\tau + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{2n} [U^n - Z, U^n - Z]_\tau$$

we have $\mathsf{E}_\mathsf{Q}[[Z, Z]_\tau] < \infty$, $\mathsf{E}_\mathsf{Q}[[M^j, M^j]_\tau] < \infty$ for $1 \leq j \leq d$. Likewise, $\mathsf{E}_\mathsf{Q}[[U^n - Z, U^n - Z]_\tau] < \infty$ and so $\mathsf{E}_\mathsf{Q}[[U^n, U^n]_\tau] < \infty$. Note that Z, M^j are no longer a martingales under Q, but we do not need that.

Let $\widetilde{\Omega} = [0, \infty) \times \Omega$. Recall that the predictable σ-field $\mathscr{P}$ is the smallest σ field on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ with respect to which all continuous adapted processes are measurable. We will define signed measures Γ_{ij} on $\mathscr{P}$ as follows: for $E \in \mathscr{P}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ let

$$\Gamma_{ij}(E) = \int_\Omega \int_0^\tau 1_E(s, \omega) d[M^i, M^j]_s(\omega) d\mathsf{P}(\omega).$$

Let $\Lambda = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \Gamma_{jj}$. From the properties of quadratic variation $[M^i, M^j]$, it follows that for all $E \in \mathscr{P}$, the matrix $((\Gamma_{ij}(E)))$ is non-negative definite. Further, Γ_{ij}

is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Λ $\forall i, j$. It follows (see appendix) that we can get predictable processes c^{ij} such that

$$\frac{d\Gamma_{ij}}{d\Lambda} = c^{ij}$$

and that $C = ((c^{ij}))$ is a non-negative definite matrix. By construction $|c^{ij}| \leq 1$. We can diagonalise C (i.e. obtain singular value decomposition) in a measurable way (see appendix) to obtain predictable processes b^{ij}, d^j such that for all i, k, (writing $\delta_{ik} = 1$ if $i = k$ and $\delta_{ik} = 0$ if $i \neq k$),)

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d} b_s^{ij} b_s^{kj} = \delta_{ik} \tag{3.12}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d} b_s^{ji} b_s^{jk} = \delta_{ik} \tag{3.13}$$

$$\sum_{j,l=1}^{d} b_s^{ij} c_s^{jl} b_s^{kl} = \delta_{ik} d_s^i \tag{3.14}$$

Since $((c_s^{ij}))$ is non-negative definite, it follows that $d_s^i \geq 0$. For $1 \leq j \leq d$, let

$$N^k = \sum_{l=1}^{d} \int b_s^{kl} dM^l.$$

Then N^k are P- martingales since b^{ik} is a bounded predictable process. Indeed, $N^k \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. Further, for $i \neq k$

$$[N^i, N^k] = \sum_{j,l=1} b_s^{ij} b_s^{kl} d[M^j, M^l]$$

and hence for any bounded predictable process h

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[\int_0^\tau h_s d[N^i,N^k]] &= \int_\Omega \int_0^\tau h_s \sum_{j,l=1}^d b_s^{ij} b_s^{kl} d[M^j,M^l] d\mathsf{P}(\omega) \\ &= \int_{\bar{\Omega}} h \sum_{j,l=1}^d b^{ij} b^{kl} d\Gamma_{jl} \\ &= \int_{\bar{\Omega}} h \sum_{j,l=1}^d b^{ij} b^{kl} c^{jl} d\Lambda \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from (3.14). As a consequence, for bounded predictable h^i,

$$\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[\sum_{i,k=1}^d \int_0^\tau h_s^i h_s^k d[N^i,N^k]_s] = \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[\sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^\tau (h_s^k)^2 d[N^k,N^k]_s] \tag{3.15}$$

Let us observe that (3.15) holds for any predictable processes $\{h^i : 1 \le i \le d\}$ provided the RHS if finite: we can first note that it holds for $\tilde{h}^i = h^i 1_{\{|h| \le c\}}$ where $|h| = \sum_{i=1}^d |h^i|$ and then let $c \uparrow \infty$. Note that for $n \ge m$

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{[U^n - U^m, U^n - U^m]_\tau} &\le \sqrt{[U^n - Z, U^n - Z]_\tau} + \sqrt{[U^m - Z, U^m - Z]_\tau} \\ &\le 2^{-m}\eta\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[[U^n - U^m, U^n - U^m]_\tau] \le 4^{-m}\alpha. \tag{3.16}$$

Let us define $g^{n,k} = \sum_{j=1}^d f^{n,j} b^{kj}$. Then note that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^d \int g^{n,k} dN^k &= \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d \int f^{n,j} b^{kj} dN^k \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{l=1}^d \int f^{n,j} b^{kj} b_s^{kl} dM^l \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \int f^{n,j} dM^j \\ &= U^n\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where in the last but one step, we have used (3.13). Noting that for $n \geq m$,

$$\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[\,[U^n - U^m, U^n - U^m]_\tau\,] = \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[\sum_{k=1}^{d}\int_0^\tau (g_s^{n,k} - g_s^{m,k})^2 d[N^k, N^k]_s] \tag{3.18}$$

and using (3.16), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{Q}(\sum_{k=1}^{d}\int_0^\tau (g_s^{n,k} - g_s^{m,k})^2 d[N^k, N^k] \geq \frac{1}{m^4}) &\leq m^4 \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[\,[U^n - U^m, U^n - U^m]_\tau\,] \\ &\leq \alpha m^4 4^{-m}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Since $\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[\,[M^i, M^i]_\tau] < \infty$ for all i and $g^{n,i}$ are bounded, it follows that $\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[\,[N^i, N^i]_\tau] < \infty$. Thus defining a measure Θ on $\mathcal{P}$ by

$$\Theta(E) = \int [\sum_{k=1}^{d}\int_0^\tau 1_E(s,\omega) d[N^k, N^k]_s(\omega) d\mathsf{Q}(\omega)]$$

we get (using (3.16) and (3.18))

$$\int (g^{m+1,k} - g^{m,k})^2 d\Theta \leq \alpha 4^{-m}$$

and as a consequence, using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we get

$$\int \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |g^{m+1,k} - g^{m,k}| d\Theta \leq \sqrt{\Theta(\bar{\Omega})\alpha} < \infty.$$

Defining

$$g_s^k = \limsup_{m\to\infty} g_s^{m,k}$$

it follows that $g^{m,k} \to g^k$ a.s. Θ and as a consequence, taking limit in (3.19) as $n \to \infty$, we get

$$\mathsf{Q}(\sum_{k=1}^{d}\int_0^\tau (g_s^k - g_s^{m,k})^2 d[N^k, N^k]_s \geq \frac{1}{m^4}) \leq m^4 4^{-m}. \tag{3.20}$$

Since Q and P and equivalent measures, it follows that

$$\mathsf{P}(\sum_{k=1}^{d}\int_0^\tau (g_s^k - g_s^{m,k})^2 d[N^k, N^k]_s \geq \frac{1}{m^4}) \to 0 \text{ as } m \to \infty. \tag{3.21}$$

In view of (3.17), we have for $m \leq n$

$$[U^n, U^n]_\tau = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \int_0^\tau g_s^{n,i} g_s^{n,j} d[N^i, N^j]_s \tag{3.22}$$

and

$$[U^n - U^m, U^n - U^m]_\tau = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \int_0^\tau (g_s^{n,i} - g_s^{m,i})(g_s^{n,j} - g_s^{m,j}) d[N^i, N^j]_s. \tag{3.23}$$

Taking limit in (3.22) as $n \to \infty$, we get (using Fatou's lemma)

$$\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[\sqrt{\textstyle\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \int_0^\tau g_s^i g_s^j d[N^i, N^j]}\,] \leq \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[\,\sqrt{[Z,Z]_\tau}\,] \tag{3.24}$$

(since (3.4) implies $\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[\,\sqrt{[U^n, U^n]_\tau}\,] \to \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[\,\sqrt{[Z,Z]_\tau}\,]$). Let us define bounded predictable processes ϕ^j and predictable process h^n, h and a P-martingale X as follows:

$$h_s = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d} |g_s^i| \tag{3.25}$$

$$\phi_s^j = \frac{g_s^j}{h_s} \tag{3.26}$$

$$X_t = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \int_0^t \phi_s^j dN_s^j \tag{3.27}$$

Since ϕ^j is predictable, $|\phi^j| \leq 1$ it follows that $X \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ and

$$[X, X]_t = \sum_{j,k=1}^{d} \int_0^t \phi_s^j \phi_s^k d[N^j, N^k]_s. \tag{3.28}$$

Noting that $g_s^j = h_s \phi_s^j$ by definition, we conclude using (3.24) that

$$\int_0^t (h_s)^2 d[X, X]_s = \sum_{j,k=1}^{d} \int_0^t g_s^j g_s^k d[N^j, N^k]_s$$

and hence that

$$\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[\sqrt{\textstyle\int_0^\tau (h_s)^2 d[X,X]_s}] \leq \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[\,\sqrt{[Z,Z]_\tau}\,] \tag{3.29}$$

Since $h = h1_{[0,\tau]}$, we conclude that $h \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(X)$ and $Y = \int h dX$ is a martingale with $Y_t = Y_{t\wedge\tau}$ for all t. Observe that

$$[U^n, X]_t = \sum_{k,j=1}^{d} \int_0^t g_s^{n,k} \phi_s^j d[N^k, N^j]_s$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
[U^n, Y]_t &= \int_0^t h_s d[U^n, X]_s \\
&= \sum_{k,j=1}^{d} \int_0^t g_s^{n,k} h_s \phi_s^j d[N^k, N^j]_s \\
&= \sum_{k,j=1}^{d} \int_0^t g_s^{n,k} g_s^j d[N^k, N^j]_s
\end{aligned}$$

and as a consequence

$$\begin{aligned}
[U^n - Y, U^n - Y]_t &= [U^n, U^n]_t - 2[U^n, Y]_t + [Y, Y]_t \\
&= \sum_{k,j=1}^{d} \int_0^t g_s^{n,k} g_s^{n,j} d[N^k, N^j]_s - 2 \sum_{k,j=1}^{d} \int_0^t g_s^{n,k} g_s^j d[N^k, N^j]_s \\
&\quad + \sum_{k,j=1}^{d} \int_0^t g_s^k g_s^j d[N^k, N^j]_s \\
&= \sum_{k,j=1}^{d} \int_0^t (g_s^{n,k} - g_s^k)(g_s^{n,j} - g_s^j) d[N^k, N^j]_s
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[[U^n - Y, U^n - Y]_\tau] = \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[\sum_{k=1}^{d} \int_0^\tau (g_s^{n,k} - g_s^k)^2 d[N^k, N^k]_s \tag{3.30}$$

where we have used (3.15). Taking lim inf on the RHS in (3.18) and using (3.16), we conclude

$$\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[\sum_{k=1}^{d} \int_0^\tau (g_s^k - g_s^{m,k})^2 d[N^k, N^k]_s] \leq \alpha 4^{-m}$$

and hence

$$\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[[U^n - Y, U^n - Y]_\tau] \leq \alpha 4^{-n}.$$

Thus $[U^n - Y, U^n - Y]_\tau \to 0$ in Q-probability and hence in P-probability. By assumption, $[U^n - Z, U^n - Z]_\tau \to 0$ in P-probability. Since

$$[Y - Z, Y - Z]_\tau \leq 2([Y - U^n, Y - U^n]_\tau + [Z - U^n, Z - U^n]_\tau)$$

for every n, it follows that

$$[Y - Z, Y - Z]_\tau = 0 \ \ a.s.\ \mathsf{P}. \tag{3.31}$$

Since Y, Z are P-martingales such that $Z_t = Z_{t\wedge\tau}$ and $Y_t = Y_{t\wedge\tau}$, (3.31) implies $Y_t - Y_0 = Z_t - Z_0$ for all t. Recall that by construction, $Y_0 = 0$, $Y = \int h dX$ and $h \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(X)$, $X \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. Thus (3.10) holds. ∎

We now come to the proof of Theorem 2.2. Let $Z^n \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ be such that $\mathsf{E}[|Z^n_t - Z_t|] \to 0$ for all t. We have to show that $Z \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$.

Using Lemma 3.3, get a sequence of stopping times $\sigma_k \uparrow \infty$ and a subsequence $\{n^j\}$ such that $Y^j = Z^{n^j}$ satisfies for each $k \geq 1$, $\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[Z, Z]_{\sigma_k}}] < \infty$ and

$$\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[Y^j - Z, Y^j - Z]_{\sigma_k}}\,] \to 0 \text{ as } j \uparrow \infty.$$

Let us now fix a k and let $\tilde{Z}_t = Z_{t\wedge\sigma_k}$. We will show that $\tilde{Z} \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. This will complete the proof in view of Lemma 3.2.

Using Lemma 3.7, for each n, get j_n such that

$$\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[Y^{j_n} - \tilde{Z}, Y^{j_n} - \tilde{Z}]_{\sigma_k}}\,] \leq 4^{-j-1}$$

For each n, taking $V = Y^{j_n}$ and $\epsilon = 4^{-j-1}$, get $U^n \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ such that

$$\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[Y^{j_n} - U^n, Y^{j_n} - U^n]_{\sigma_k}}\,] \leq 4^{-j-1}.$$

Then we have

$$\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[U^n - \tilde{Z}, U^n - \tilde{Z}]_{\sigma_k}}\,] \leq 4^{-j}.$$

with $U^n \in \mathbb{C}_b(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$.

This $\tilde{Z} \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ in view of Lemma 3.9 ∎

Now we turn to proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $\xi^n \in \mathbb{G}_T$ be such that $\xi^n \to \xi$ in $\mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathsf{P})$. Let $\xi^n = X^n_T$ where $X^n \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. Let us define $Z^n_t = X^n_{t\wedge T}$. Then $Z^n \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ and the assumption on ξ^n implies

$$Z^n_t \to Z_t = \mathsf{E}[\xi \mid \mathscr{F}_t] \text{ in } \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathsf{P}) \ \ \forall t.$$

Thus Theorem 2.2 implies $Z \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ and thus $\xi = Z_T$ belongs to $\mathbb{G}_T$. ∎

4 Sigma-martingales

For a semimartingale X, let $L(X)$ denote the class of predictable process f such that X admits a decomposition $X = N + A$ with N being a local martingale, A being a process with finite variation paths with $f \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(N)$ and

$$\int_0^t |f_s| d|A|_s < \infty \ \ a.s. \ \ \forall t < \infty. \tag{4.1}$$

Then for $f \in \mathbb{L}(X)$, the stochastic integral $\int f dX$ is defined as $\int f dN + \int f dA$. It can be shown that the definition does not depend upon the decomposition $X = N + A$. See [11].

Let M be a martingale, $f \in \mathbb{L}(M)$ and $Z = \int f dM$. Then Z is a local martingale if and only if $f \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(M)$. In answer to a question raised by P. A. Meyer, Chou [3] introduced a class Σ_m of semimartingales consisting of $Z = \int f dM$ for $f \in \mathbb{L}(M)$. Emery [7] constructed example of f, M such that $f \in \mathbb{L}(M)$ but $Z = \int f dM$ is not a local martingale. Such processes occur naturally in mathematical finance and have been called sigma-martingales by Delbaen and Schachermayer[5].

DEFINITION **4.2** A semimartingale X is said to be a sigma-martingale if there exists a $(0, \infty)$ valued predictable process ϕ such that $\phi \in \mathbb{L}(X)$ and

$$M_t = \int_0^t \phi_s dX_s \tag{4.3}$$

is a martingale.

Our first observation is:

LEMMA **4.4** *Every local martingale N is a sigma-martingale.*

PROOF : Let $\eta_n \uparrow \infty$ be a sequence of stopping times such that $N_{t\wedge\eta_n}$ is a martingale,

$$\sigma_n = \inf\{t \geq 0 \,:\, |N_t| \geq n \text{ or } |N_{t-}| \geq n\} \wedge n$$

and $\tau_n = \sigma_n \wedge \eta_n$, then it follows that $N_{t\wedge\tau_n}$ is a uniformly integrable martingale and $a_n = \mathsf{E}[\,[N,N]_{\tau_n}] < \infty$.

Define

$$h_s = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n(1+a_n)} 1_{(\tau_{n-1},\tau_n]}.$$

Then h being bounded belongs to $\mathbb{L}(N)$ and $M = \int h dN$ is a local martingale with

$$\sup_{t<\infty} \mathsf{E}[\,[M,M]_t] < \infty. \tag{4.5}$$

Thus M is a uniformly integrable martingale. Since h is $(0,\infty)$ valued by definition, it follows that N is a sigma-martingale. ∎

This leads to

LEMMA **4.6** *A semimartingale X is a sigma-martingale if and only if there exists a uniformly integrable martingale M satisfying* (4.5) *and a predictable process $\psi \in \mathbb{L}(M)$ such that*

$$X_t = \int_0^t \psi_s dM_s. \tag{4.7}$$

PROOF : Let X be given by (4.7) with M being a martingale satisfying (4.5) and $\psi \in \mathbb{L}(M)$, then defining

$$g_s = \frac{1}{(1+(\psi_s)^2)}, \quad N_t = \int_0^t g_s dX_s$$

it follows that $N = \int g\psi dM$. Since $g\psi$ is bounded by 1 and M satisfies (4.5), it follows that N is a martingale. Thus X is a sigma-martingale.

Conversely, given a sigma-martingale X and a $(0,\infty)$ valued predictable process ϕ such that $N = \int \phi dX$ is a martingale, get h as in Lemma 4.4 and let $M = \int h dN =$

$\int h\phi dX$. Then M is a uniformly integrable martingale that satisfies (4.5) and $h\phi$ is a $(0,\infty)$ valued predictable process. ∎

From the definition, it is not obvious that sum of sigma-martingales is also a sigma-martingale, but this is so as the next result shows.

THEOREM **4.8** *Let X^1, X^2 be sigma-martingales and a_1, a_2 be real numbers. Then $Y = a_1X^1 + a_2X^2$ is also a sigma-martingale.*

PROOF : Let ϕ^1, ϕ^2 be $(0,\infty)$ valued predictable processes such that

$$M_t^i = \int_0^t \phi_s^i dX_s^i, \quad i = 1, 2$$

are uniformly integrable martingales. Then, writing $\xi = \min(\phi^1, \phi^2)$ and $\eta_s^i = \frac{\xi_s}{\phi_s^i}$, it follows that

$$N_t^i = \int_0^t \eta_s^i dM_s^i = \int_0^t \xi_s dX_s^i$$

are uniformly integrable martingales since η^i is bounded by one. Clearly, $Y = a_1X^1 + a_2X^2$ is a semimartingale and $\xi \in \mathbb{L}(X^i)$ for $i = 1, 2$ implies $\xi \in \mathbb{L}(Y)$ and

$$\int_0^t \xi_s dY_s = a_1N_s^1 + a_2N_s^2$$

is a uniformly integrable martingale. Since ξ is $(0,\infty)$ valued predictable process, it follows that Y is a sigma-martingale. ∎

The following result gives conditions under which a sigma-martingale is a local martingale.

LEMMA **4.9** *Let X be a sigma-martingale with $X_0 = 0$. Then X is a local martingale if and only if there exists a sequence of stopping times $\tau_n \uparrow \infty$ such that*

$$\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[X,X]_{\tau_n}}] < \infty \ \ \forall n. \tag{4.10}$$

PROOF : Let X be a sigma-martingale and ϕ, ψ, M be such that (4.3), (4.5) holds. Let $\psi_s = \frac{1}{\phi_s}$ and as noted above, (4.7) holds. Then

$$[X,X]_t = \int_0^t (\psi_s)^2 d[M,M]_s.$$

Defining $\psi_s^k = \psi_s 1_{\{|\psi_s| \le k\}}$, it follows that

$$X^k = \int_0^t \psi_s^k dM_s$$

is a uniformly integrable martingale. Noting that for $k \ge 1$

$$[X - X^k, X - X^k]_t = \int_0^t (\psi_s)^2 1_{\{k<|\psi_s|\}} d[M, M]_s$$

the assumption (4.10) implies that for each n fixed,

$$\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[X - X^k, X - X^k]_{\tau_n}}] \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

The Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality ($p = 1$) implies that for each n fixed,

$$\mathsf{E}[\sup_{0 \le t \le \tau_n} |X_t - X_t^k|] \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

and as a consequence $X_t^{[n]} = X_{t \wedge \tau_n}$ is a martingale for all n and so X is a local martingale. Conversely, if X is a local martingale with $X_0 = 0$, and σ_n are stop times increasing to ∞ such that $X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}$ are martingales then defining $\zeta_n = \inf\{t : |X_t| \ge n\}$ and $\tau_n = \sigma_n \wedge \zeta_n$, it follows that $\mathbb{E}[|X_{\tau_n}|] < \infty$ and since

$$\sup_{t \le \tau_n} |X_t| \le n + |X_{\tau_n}|$$

it follows that $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \le \tau_n} |X_t|] < \infty$. Thus, (4.10) holds in view of Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality ($p = 1$). ∎

The previous result gives us:

COROLLARY **4.11** *A bounded sigma-martingale X is a martingale.*

PROOF : Since X is bounded, say by K, it follows that jumps of X are bounded by $2K$. Thus jumps of the increasing process $[X, X]$ are bounded by $4K^2$ and thus X satisfies (4.10) for

$$\tau_n = \inf\{t \ge 0 : [X, X]_t \ge n\}.$$

Thus X is a local martingale and being bounded, it is a martingale. ∎

Here is a variant of the example given by Emery [7] of a sigma-martingale that is not a local martingale.. Let τ be a random variable with exponential distribution (assumed to be $(0,\infty)$ valued without loss of generailty) and ξ with $\mathsf{P}(\xi = 1) = \mathsf{P}(\xi = -1) = 0.5$, independent of τ. Let

$$M_t = \xi 1_{[\tau,\infty)}(t)$$

and $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(M_s : s \leq t)$. Easy to see that M is a martingale. Let $f_t = \frac{1}{t}1_{(0,\infty)}(t)$ and $X_t = \int_0^t f dM$. Then X is a sigma-martingale and

$$[X,X]_t = \frac{1}{\tau^2}1_{[\tau,\infty)}(t).$$

For any stopping time σ, it can be checked that σ is a constant on $\sigma < \tau$ and thus if σ is not identically equal to 0, $\sigma \geq (\tau \wedge a)$ for some $a > 0$. Thus, $\sqrt{[X,X]_\sigma} \geq \frac{1}{\tau}1_{\{\tau<a\}}$. It follows that for any stop time σ, not identically zero, $\mathsf{E}[\sqrt{[X,X]_\sigma}] = \infty$ and so X is not a local martingale.

The next result shows that $\int f dX$ is a sigma-martingale if X is one.

LEMMA **4.12** *Let X be a sigma-martingale, $f \in \mathbb{L}(X)$ and let $U = \int f dX$. Then U is a sigma-martingale.*

PROOF : Let M be a martingale and $\psi \in \mathbb{L}(M)$ be such that $X = \int \psi dM$ (as in Lemma 4.6). Now $U = \int f dX = \int f\psi dM$. Thus, once again invoking Lemma 4.6, one concludes that X is a sigma-martingale. ∎

We now introduce the class of equivalent sigma-martingale measures (ESMM) and show that it is a convex set.

DEFINITION **4.13** Let $X^1, \ldots, X^d$ be r.c.l.l. adapted processes and let $\mathbb{E}^s(X^1, \ldots, X^d)$ denote the class of probability measures Q such that $X^1, \ldots, X^d$ are sigma-martingales w.r.t. Q.

Let

$$\mathbb{E}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(X^1, \ldots, X^d) = \{\mathsf{Q} \in \mathbb{E}^s(X^1, \ldots, X^d) \ : \ \mathsf{Q} \text{ is equivalent to } \mathsf{P}\}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(X^1,\ldots,X^d) = \{\mathsf{Q} \in \mathbb{E}^s(X^1,\ldots,X^d) \,:\, \mathsf{Q} \text{ is absolutely continuous w.r.t. } \mathsf{P}\}$$

THEOREM **4.14** *For semimartingales $X^1,\ldots,X^d$, $\mathbb{E}^s(X^1,\ldots,X^d)$, $\mathbb{E}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(X^1,\ldots,X^d)$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(X^1,\ldots,X^d)$ are convex sets.*

PROOF : Let us consider the case $d = 1$. Let $\mathsf{Q}^1, \mathsf{Q}^2 \in \mathbb{E}^s(X)$. Let ϕ^1, ϕ^2 be $(0,\infty)$ valued predictable processes such that

$$M^i_t = \int_0^t \phi^i_s dX_s$$

are martingales under Q_i, $i = 1, 2$. Let $\phi_s = min(\phi^1_s, \phi^2_s)$ and let

$$M_t = \int_0^t \phi_s dX_s.$$

Noting that $M_t = \int_0^t \xi^i_s dM^i_s$ where $\xi_s = \phi_s(\phi^i_s)^{-1}$ is bounded, it follows that M is a martingale under $\mathsf{Q}^i, i = 1, 2$. Now if Q is any convex combination of $\mathsf{Q}^1, \mathsf{Q}^2$, it follows that M is a Q martingale and hence $X_t = \int_0^t (\phi_s)^{-1} dM_s$ is a sigma-martingale under Q. Thus $\mathbb{E}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(X)$ is a convex set. Since $\mathbb{E}^s(X^1,\ldots,X^d) = \cap_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}^s(X^j)$ it follows that $\mathbb{E}^s(X^1,\ldots,X^d)$ is convex. Convexity of $\mathbb{E}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(X^1,\ldots,X^d)$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(X^1,\ldots,X^d)$ follows from this. ∎

In analogy with the definition of $\mathbb{C}$ for martingales $M^1,\ldots,M^d$, for sigma-martingales $M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d$ let

$$\mathbb{C}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d) = \{Z \in \mathbb{M} \,:\, Z_t = Z_0 + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^t f^j_s dM^j_s,\ f^j \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(M^j)\}$$

$$\mathbb{F}(M^1,\ldots,M^d) = \{Z \in \mathbb{M} : Z_t = Z_0 + \int_0^t f_s dY_s,\ f \in \mathbb{L}^1_m(Y),\ Y \in \mathbb{C}(M^1,\ldots,M^d)\}.$$

LEMMA **4.15** *Let $M^1,\ldots,M^d$ be sigma-martingales and let ϕ^j be $(0,\infty)$ valued predictable processes such that*

$$N^j_t = \int_0^t \phi^j_s dM^j_s \tag{4.16}$$

are uniformly integrable martingales. Then

$$\mathbb{C}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d) = \mathbb{C}(N^1, N^2, \ldots, N^d) \tag{4.17}$$

$$\mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d) = \mathbb{F}(N^1, N^2, \ldots, N^d). \tag{4.18}$$

PROOF : Let $\psi^j_s = (\phi^j_s)^{-1}$. Note that $M^j = \int \psi^j dN^j$. Then if $Y \in \mathbb{C}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ is given by

$$Y_t = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \int_0^t f^j_s dM^j_s, \quad f^j \in \mathbb{L}(M^j) \tag{4.19}$$

then defining $g^j = f^j \psi^j$, we can see that $g^j \in \mathbb{L}(N^j)$ and $\int f^j dM^j = \int g^j dN^j$. Thus

$$Y_t = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \int_0^t g^j_s dN^j_s, \quad g^j \in \mathbb{L}(N^j). \tag{4.20}$$

Similarly, if $Y \in \mathbb{C}(N^1, N^2, \ldots, N^d)$ is given by (4.20), then defining $f^j = \phi^j g^j$, we can see that Y satisfies (4.19). Thus (4.17) is true. Now (4.18) follows from (4.17). ∎

5 Integral Representation w.r.t. Martingales

Let $M^1, \ldots, M^d$ be sigma-martingales.

DEFINITION **5.1** A sigma-martingale N is said to have an integral representation w.r.t. $M^1, \ldots, M^d$ if $N \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ or in other words, $\exists Y \in \mathbb{C}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ and $f \in \mathbb{L}(Y)$ such that

$$N_t = N_0 + \int_0^t f_s dY_s \quad \forall t. \tag{5.2}$$

Here is another observation needed later.

LEMMA **5.3** *Let M be a P-martingale. Let Q be a probability measure equivalent to P. Let $\xi = \frac{d\mathsf{P}}{d\mathsf{Q}}$ and let Z be the r.c.l.l. martingale given by $Z_t = \mathsf{E}_\mathsf{P}[\xi \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$. Then*

(i) M is a Q-martingale if and only if MZ is a P-martingale.

(ii) M is a Q-local martingale if and only if MZ is a P-local martingale.

(iii) If M is a Q-local martingale then $[M,Z]$ is a P-local martingale.

(iv) If M is a Q-sigma-martingale then $[M,Z]$ is a P-sigma-martingale.

PROOF : For a stopping time σ, let η be a non-negative $\mathcal{F}_\sigma$ measurable random variable. Then

$$\mathsf{E}_\mathsf{Q}[\eta] = \mathsf{E}_\mathsf{P}[\eta Z] = \mathsf{E}_\mathsf{P}[\eta \mathsf{E}[Z \mid \mathcal{F}_\sigma]\,] = \mathsf{E}_\mathsf{P}[\eta Z_\sigma].$$

Thus M_s is Q integrable if and only if $M_s Z_s$ is P-integrable. Further, for any stopping time σ,

$$\mathsf{E}_\mathsf{Q}[M_\sigma] = \mathsf{E}_\mathsf{P}[M_\sigma Z_\sigma]. \tag{5.4}$$

Thus (i) follows from the observation that an integrable adapted process N is a martingale if and only if $\mathsf{E}[N_\sigma] = \mathsf{E}[N_0]$ for all bounded stopping times σ. For (ii), if M is a Q-local martingale, then get stopping times $\tau_n \uparrow \infty$ such that for each n, $M_{t\wedge\tau_n}$ is a martingale. Then we have

$$\mathsf{E}_\mathsf{Q}[M_{\sigma\wedge\tau_n}] = \mathsf{E}_\mathsf{P}[M_{\sigma\wedge\tau_n} Z_{\sigma\wedge\tau_n}]. \tag{5.5}$$

Thus $M_{t\wedge\tau_n} Z_{t\wedge\tau_n}$ is a P-martingale and thus MZ is a P- local martingale. The converse follows similarly.

For (iii), note that $M_t Z_t = M_0 Z_0 + \int_0^t M_{s-}\, dZ_s + \int_0^t Z_{s-}\, dM_s + [M,Z]_t$ and the two stochastic integrals are P local martingales, the result follows from (ii). For (iv), representing the Q sigma-martingale M as $M = \int \psi\, dN$, where N is a Q martingale and $\psi \in \mathbb{L}(N)$, we see

$$[M,Z] = \int_0^t \psi_s\, d[N,Z]_s.$$

By (iii), $[N,Z]$ is a Q sigma-martingale and hence $[M,Z]$ is a Q sigma-martingale. ∎

The main result on integral representation is:

THEOREM **5.6** *Let $\mathcal{F}_0$ be trivial. Let $M^1, \ldots, M^d$ be sigma-martingales on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathsf{P})$. Then the following are equivalent.*

(i) Every bounded martingale admits representation w.r.t. $M^1, \ldots, M^d$.

(ii) Every uniformly integrable martingale admits representation w.r.t. $M^1, \ldots, M^d$.

(iii) Every sigma-martingale admits representation w.r.t. $M^1, \ldots, M^d$.

(iv) P *is an extreme point of the convex set* $\mathbb{E}^s(M^1, \ldots, M^d)$.

(v) $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(M^1, \ldots, M^d) = \{\mathsf{P}\}$.

(vi) $\mathbb{E}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(M^1, \ldots, M^d) = \{\mathsf{P}\}$.

PROOF : Since every bounded martingale is uniformly integrable and a uniformly integrable martinagle is a sigma-martingale, we have

$$\text{(iii)} \Rightarrow \text{(ii)} \Rightarrow \text{(i)}.$$

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) is an easy consequence of Theorem 2.2: given a uniformly integrable martingale Z, for $n \geq 1$, let us define martingales Z^n by

$$Z^n_t = \mathsf{E}[Z1_{\{|Z| \leq n\}}] \mid \mathcal{F}_t].$$

We take the r.c.l.l. version of the martingale. It is easy to see that Z^n are bounded martingales and in view of (i), $Z^n \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. Moreover, for $n \geq t$

$$\mathsf{E}[|Z^n_t - Z_t|] \leq \mathsf{E}[Z1_{\{|Z|>n\}}]$$

and hence for all t, $\mathsf{E}[|Z^n_t - Z_t|] \to 0$. Theorem 2.2 now implies $Z \in \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. This proves (ii).

We next prove (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). Let X be a sigma-martingale. In view of Lemma 4.6, get a uniformly integrable martingale N and a predictable process ψ such that

$$X = \int \psi dN.$$

Let $N_t = N_0 + \int_0^t f_s dY_s$ where $Y \in \mathbb{C}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. Then we have

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t f_s \psi dY_s$$

and thus X admits an integral representation w.r.t. $M^1, \ldots, M^d$.

Suppose (v) holds and suppose $\mathsf{Q}_1, \mathsf{Q}_2 \in \mathbb{E}^s(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ and $\mathsf{P} = \alpha\mathsf{Q}_1 + (1-\alpha)\mathsf{Q}_2$. It follows that $\mathsf{Q}_1, \mathsf{Q}_2$ are absolutely continuous w.r.t. P and hence

$\mathsf{Q}_1, \mathsf{Q}_2 \in \tilde{\mathbb{E}}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. In view of (v), $\mathsf{Q}_1 = \mathsf{Q}_2 = \mathsf{P}$ and thus P is an extreme point of $\mathbb{E}^s(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ and so (iv) is true.

Since $\mathbb{E}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d) \subseteq \tilde{\mathbb{E}}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$, it follows that (v) implies (vi). On the other hand, suppose (vi) is true and $\mathsf{Q} \in \tilde{\mathbb{E}}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. Then $\mathsf{Q}_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\mathsf{Q} + \mathsf{P}) \in \mathbb{E}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. Then (vi) implies $\mathsf{Q}_1 = \mathsf{P}$ and hence $\mathsf{Q} = \mathsf{P}$ and thus (v) holds.

Till now we have proved (i) $\iff$ (ii) $\iff$ (iii) and (iv) $\Leftarrow$ (v) $\iff$ (vi). To complete the proof, we will show (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (v) and (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i).

Suppose that (iii) is true and let $\mathsf{Q} \in \tilde{\mathbb{E}}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. Now let ξ be the Radon-Nikodym derivative of Q w.r.t. P. Let R denote the r.c.l.l. martingale: $R_t = \mathsf{E}[\xi \mid \mathscr{F}_t]$. Since $\mathscr{F}_0$ is trivial, $N_0 = 1$. In view of property (iii), we can get $Y \in \mathbb{C}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ and a predictable processes $f \in \mathbb{L}(Y)$ such that

$$R_t = 1 + \int_0^t f_s dY_s. \tag{5.7}$$

Note that

$$[R, R]_t = \int_0^t f_s^2 d[Y, Y]_s. \tag{5.8}$$

Since M^j is a sigma-martingale under Q for each j, it follows that Y is a Q sigma-martingale. By Lemma 5.3, this gives $[Y, R]$ is a P sigma-martingale and hence

$$V_t^k = \int_0^t f_s 1_{\{|f_s| \le k\}} d[Y, R]_s \tag{5.9}$$

is a P sigma-martingale. Noting that

$$[Y, R]_t = \int_0^t f_s d[Y, Y]_s$$

we see that

$$V_t^k = \int_0^t f_s^2 1_{\{|f_s| \le k\}} d[Y, Y]_s. \tag{5.10}$$

Thus we can get $(0, \infty)$ valued predictable processes ϕ^j such that

$$U_t^k = \int_0^t \phi_s^k dV_s^k$$

is a martingale. But U^k is a non-negative martingale with $U_0^k = 0$. As a result U^k is identically equal to 0 and thus so is V^k. It then follows that (see (5.8)) $[R, R] = 0$ which yields R is identical to 1 and so $\mathsf{Q} = \mathsf{P}$. Thus $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$ is a singleton. Thus (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (v).

To complete the proof, we will now prove that (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Suppose $M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d$ are such that P is an extreme point of $\mathbb{E}^s(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d)$. Since M^j is a sigma-martingale under P, we can choose $(0, \infty)$ valued predictable ϕ^j such that

$$N_t^j = \int_0^t \phi_s^j dM_s^j$$

is a uniformly integrable martingale under P and as seen in Lemma 4.15, we then have

$$\mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d) = \mathbb{F}(N^1, N^2, \ldots, N^d).$$

Suppose (i) is not true. We will show that this leads to a contradiction. So suppose S is a bounded martingale that does not admit representation w.r.t. $M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d$, *i.e.* $S \notin \mathbb{F}(M^1, M^2, \ldots, M^d) = \mathbb{F}(N^1, N^2, \ldots, N^d)$, then for some T,

$$S_T \notin \mathbb{K}_T(N^1, N^2, \ldots, N^d)$$

We have proven in Theorem 2.1 that $\mathbb{K}_T(N^1, N^2, \ldots, N^d)$ is closed in $\mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathsf{P})$. Since $\mathbb{K}_T$ is not equal to $\mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathscr{F}_T, \mathsf{P})$, by the Hahn-Banach Theorem, there exists $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\Omega, \mathscr{F}_T, \mathsf{P})$, $\mathsf{P}(\xi \neq 0) > 0$ such that

$$\int \eta \xi d\mathsf{P} = 0 \ \ \forall \eta \in \mathbb{K}_T.$$

Then for all constants c, we have

$$\int \eta(1 + c\xi) d\mathsf{P} = \int \eta d\mathsf{P} \ \ \forall \eta \in \mathbb{K}_T. \tag{5.11}$$

Since ξ is bounded, we can choose a $c > 0$ such that

$$\mathsf{P}(c|\xi| < \frac{1}{2}) = 1.$$

Now, let Q be the measure with density $\eta = (1 + c\xi)$. Then Q is a probability measure. Thus (5.11) yields

$$\int \eta d\mathsf{Q} = \int \eta d\mathsf{P} \ \ \forall \eta \in \mathbb{K}_T. \tag{5.12}$$

For any bounded stop time $\tau$and $1 \leq j \leq d$, $N^j_{\tau\wedge T} \in \mathbb{K}_T$ and hence

$$\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[N^j_{\tau\wedge T}] = \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[N^j_{\tau\wedge T}] = N^j_0 \tag{5.13}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[N^j_{\tau\vee T}] &= \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[\eta N^j_{\tau\vee T}] \\
&= \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[\eta N^j_{\tau\vee T} \mid \mathscr{F}_T]] \\
&= \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[\eta \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[N^j_{\tau\vee T} \mid \mathscr{F}_T]] \\
&= \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{P}}[\eta N_T] \\
&= \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[N_T] \\
&= N^j_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

where we have used the facts that η is $\mathscr{F}_T$ measurable, N^j is a P martingale and (5.13). Now

$$\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[N^j_\tau] = \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[N^j_{\tau\wedge T}] + \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[N^j_{\tau\vee T}] - \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[N^j_T] = N^j_0.$$

Thus N^j is a Q martingale and since

$$M^j = \int_0^t \frac{1}{\phi^j_s} dN^j_s$$

it follows that M^j is a Q sigma-martingale. Thus $\mathsf{Q} \in \mathbb{E}^s(M^1, \ldots, M^d)$. Similarly, if $\tilde{\mathsf{Q}}$ is the measure with density $\eta = (1 - c\xi)$, we can prove that $\tilde{\mathsf{Q}} \in \mathbb{E}^s(M^1, \ldots, M^d)$. Since $\mathsf{P} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathsf{Q} + \tilde{\mathsf{Q}})$, this contradicts the assumption that P is an extreme point of $\mathbb{E}^s(M^1, \ldots, M^d)$. Thus (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i). This completes the proof. ∎

6 Completeness of Markets

Let the (discounted) prices of d securities be given by $X^1, \ldots, X^d$. We assume that X^j are semimartingales and that they satisfy the property NFLVR so that an ESMM exists.

THEOREM **6.1 The Second Fundamental Theorem Of Asset Pricing**
Let $X^1, \ldots, X^d$ be semimartingales on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathsf{P})$ such that $\mathbb{E}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(X^1, \ldots, X^d)$ is non-empty. Then the following are equivalent:

(a) For all $T < \infty$, for all $\mathcal{F}_T$ measurable bounded random variables ξ (bounded by say K), there exist $g^j \in \mathbb{L}(X^j)$ with

$$Y_t = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \int_0^t g_s^j dX_s^j \tag{6.2}$$

a constant c and $f \in \mathbb{L}(Y)$ such that $|\int_0^t f_s dY_s| \leq 2K$ and

$$\xi = c + \int_0^T f_s dY_s. \tag{6.3}$$

(b) The set $\mathbb{E}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(X^1, \ldots, X^d)$ is a singleton.

PROOF : First suppose that $\mathbb{E}^s_{\mathsf{P}}(X^1, \ldots, X^d) = \{\mathsf{Q}\}$. Consider the martingale $M_t = \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{Q}}[\xi \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$. Note that M is bounded by K. In view of the equivalence of (i) and (v) in Theorem 5.6, we get that M admits a representation w.r.t. $X^1, \ldots, X^d$ - thus we get $g^j \in \mathbb{L}(X^j)$ and $f \in \mathbb{L}(Y)$ where Y is given by by (6.2), with

$$M_t = M_0 + \int_0^t f_s dY_s.$$

Since $\mathcal{F}_0$ is trivial, M_0 is a constant. Since M is bounded by K, it follows that $\int_0^t f_s dY_s$ is bounded by $2K$. Thus (b) implies (a).

Now suppose (a) is true. Let Q be an ESMM. Let M_t be a martingale. We will show that $M \in \mathbb{F}(X^1, \ldots, X^d)$, *i.e.* M admits integral representation w.r.t. $X^1, \ldots, X^d$. In view of Lemmas 3.2 and 4.15, suffices to show that for each $T < \infty$, $N \in \mathbb{F}(X^1, \ldots, X^d)$, where N is defined by $N_t = M_{t \wedge T}$.

Let $\xi = N_T$. Then in view of assumption (a), we have

$$\xi = c + \int_0^T f_s dY_s$$

with Y given by (6.2), a constant c and $f \in \mathbb{L}(Y)$ such that $U_t = \int_0^t f_s dY_s$ is bounded. Since U is a sigma-martingale that is bounded, it follows that U is a martingale. It follows that

$$N_t = c + \int_0^t f_s dY_s, \;\; 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Thus $N \in \mathbb{F}(X^1, \ldots, X^d)$.

We have proved that (i) in Theorem 5.6 holds and hence (v) holds, *i.e.* the ESMM is unique. ∎

APPENDIX

For a non-negative definite symmetric matrix C, the eigenvalue-eigenvector decomposition gives us a representation

$$C = B^T D B \tag{A.1}$$

$$B \text{ is a orthogonal matrix and } D \text{ is a diagonal matrix.} \tag{A.2}$$

This decomposition is not unique, but for each non-negative definite symmetric matrix C, the set of pairs (B, D) satisfying (A.1)-(A.2) is compact. Thus it admits a measurable selection, in other words, there exists a Borel mapping θ such that $\theta(C) = (B, D)$ where B, C, D satisfy (A.1)-(A.2). (See [8] or Corollary 5.2.6 [16]).

Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a σ-field on a non-empty set Γ and for $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, λ_{ij} be σ-finite signed measures on $(\Gamma, \mathcal{D})$ such that

For all $E \in \mathcal{D}$, the matrix$((\lambda_{ij}(E)))$ is a symmetric non-negative definite matrix. Let $\theta(E) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_{ii}(E)$. Then for $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ there exists a version c^{ij} of the Radon-Nikodym derivate $\frac{d\lambda_{ij}}{d\theta}$ such that for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$, the matrix $((c^{ij}(\gamma)))$ is non-negative definite.

To see this, for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq d$ let f^{ij} be a version of the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{d\lambda_{ij}}{d\theta}$ and let $f^{ji} = f^{ij}$. For rationals $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_d$, let

$$A_{r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_d} = \{\gamma : \sum_{ij} r_i r_j f^{ij}(\gamma) < 0\}.$$

Then $\theta(A_{r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_d}) = 0$ and hence $\theta(A) = 0$ where

$$A = \cup\{A_{r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_d} : \ r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_d \text{ rationals}\}.$$

The required version is now given by

$$c^{ij}(\gamma) = f^{ij}(\gamma) 1_{A^c}(\gamma).$$

References

[1] Bhatt, A. G. and Karandikar, R. L.: On the Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing, *Communications on Stochastic Analysis* **9** (2015), 251 - 265.

[2] Cherny, A. S. and Shiryaev, A. N.: Vector stochastic integrals and the fundamental theorems of asset pricing, *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics*, **237** (2002), 6 - 49.

[3] Chou, C. S.: Characterisation dune classe de semimartingales. *Seminaire de Probabilites XIII, Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **721** (1977), Springer-Verlag, 250 - 252.

[4] Delbaen, F. and Schachermayer, W.: A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing, *Mathematische Annalen* **300** (1994), 463 - 520.

[5] Delbaen, F. and Schachermayer, W.: The Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing for Unbounded Stochastic Processes, *Mathematische Annalen* **312** (1998), 215-250.

[6] Davis, M. H. A. and Varaiya, P. : On the multiplicity of an increasing family of sigma-fields. *Annals of Probability* **2** (1974), 958 - 963.

[7] Emery, M. : Compensation de processus a variation finie non localement integrables. *Seminaire de Probabilites XIV, Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **784** (1980), Springer-Verlag, 152 - 160.

[8] Graf, S. : A measurable selection theorem for compact-valued maps. *Manuscripta Math.* **27** (1979), 341 - 352.

[9] Harrison, M. and Pliska, S.: Martingales and Stochastic Integrals in the theory of continuous trading, *Stochastic Processes and Applications* **11** (1981), 215 - 260.

[10] Ito, K. Lectures on stochastic processes, *Tata Institute of Fundamental Research*, Bombay, (1961).

[11] Jacod, J.: Calcul Stochastique et Problemes de Martingales. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **714**, (1979), Springer-Verlag.

[12] Jacod, J. : Integrales stochastiques par rapport a une semi-martingale vectorielle et changements de filtration. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **784** (1980), Springer-Verlag, 161 - 172.

[13] Jacod, J. and Yor, M.: Etude des solutions extremales et representation intgrale des solutions pour certains problemes de martingales. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie ver. Geb.*, **125** (1977), 38 - 83.

[14] Meyer, P. A.: Un cours sur les integrales stochastiques. *Seminaire de Probabilites X, Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **511** (1976), Springer-Verlag, 245 - 400.

[15] Protter, P.: Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations. (1980), Springer-Verlag.

[16] Srivastava, S. M.: A Course on Borel Sets. (1998), Springer-Verlag.

[17] Yor, M.: Sous-espaces denses dans L^1 ou H^1 et representation des martingales. *Seminaire de Probabilites XII, Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **649** (1978), Springer-Verlag, 265 - 309.

Address: H1 Sipcot IT Park, Siruseri, Kelambakkam 603103, India
E-mail: rlk@cmi.ac.in, bvrao@cmi.ac.in